**First,** Obligations are agent specific. The obligations of a surgeon are different than that of a soldier, whose obligation is different from that of the government. In terms of the resolution, the actor is a government because a) it’s specified explicitly **AND** b) this is the only actor capable of requiring employers to pay a living wage.

**Second**, obligations also differ between contexts. Abstract rules, which seek to apply to all action, can never account for the vast number of exceptions to every rule in the governmental context. An abstract appeal to an obligation to not kill, for instance, cannot be appealed to in times of war or in questions of the death penalty since the state operates with an entirely different purpose in different contexts. Any theory that does not make these specific contextual analyses will always be lacking insofar as it will attempt to simplify and reduce events that can only be explained through context.

**Third,** standards used to adjudicate who wins or loses the debate must be able to weigh offense without collapsing to permissibility or presumption. This a) maximizes topical education, b) maximizes clash, and c) minimizes judge intervention, since hardcore permissibility presumption debates are essentially irresolvable and have nothing to do with the topic. Also, by definition government’s wouldn’t use filtering mechanisms that can’t produce an answer to the question of what ought be done since that would result in paralysis. This means your standard must be functional as a weighing mechanism.

**Next**, according to Merriam-Webster[[1]](#footnote-1) dictionary, ought is used to express obligation. Prefer this definition because this is the first definition on Merriam-Webster, and thus the most commonly used definition. The Online Etymology Dictionary[[2]](#footnote-2) explains the main modern use of ought is As an auxiliary verb expressing duty or obligation. Common usage is the most important standard in determining the legitimacy of definitions because words can only obtain meanings by how they are used.

**Because** the actor is a government, the **value** is fulfilling government obligations. **The standard** is maximizing expected well-being, Several warrants:

**First,** Governments are created and given authority for the purpose of protecting their citizens—thus, that is their primary obligation. If this were not true, there would be no rational reason we would consent to being governed, as the government could abuse our rights. The fact that we pay taxes proves the obvious fact that we expect protection from the government. This link turns your meta-ethic because no starting point that is rational can conclude that the aff framework is wrong. Also answers the is ought fallacy because **a)** the is wouldn’t have come about if there wasn’t a good reason for it, i.e. government’s wouldn’t have started protecting citizens if they ought not have, and **b)** my argument is that government’s ought to protect citizens to respect consent.

**Second**, the difference between actions and omissions isn’t relevant for governments, especially in economic policy. That distinction makes sense in the context of individual lives and actions, but government’s are third parties created for resolving conflicts between individuals that would have otherwise been resolved violently. The whole point of economic policy is to help adjudicate competing conflicts of interest. **Also,** act omission distinction has no unique warrant because omissions take the action of doing nothing. Everything is an action—the distinction is purely semantic. **Furthermore**, the act-omission distinction is artificial because human decision-making evaluates both the choice to do something and the choice to abstain from it. Since all policy-makers must regulate third party action, both action and inaction are calculated choices that affect populations—when nations make choices, their choices are simply comparisons between expected worlds of doing and forgoing the action. **But,** even if the act-omission exists, proving an omission does not sufficiently excuse responsibility, but instead collapses down to the next tier. For example, we’d think it’s bad to let a child drown in front of us, but probably okay not to donate all our money to feed starving Indonesian kids. This means we can determine responsibility in omissions based on factors like directness, practicality, or opportunity cost to donate. **And,** governments uniquely can’t diffuse responsibility by omission because governments always have a duty to their citizens. The fact that we can read literature on living wages that attempts to quantify and predict the economic effect indicates that living wage policy is a direct, practical action that government’s can undergo. **If** there is no act-omission distinction, then we are fully complicit with any harms we allow, so actions are moral if they minimize harm. It also means philosophies that focus on actions as opposed to consequences can’t weigh offense since the only effective way of prioritizing competing actions is via act/omission distinction. Also, even if your philosophy could weigh without act/omission, it would do so by analyzing severity of the violation, which requires an analysis of end states, conceding util.

Third, absolute standards are logically incoherent since they produce irresolvable conflicts between duties. Two warrants: **A)** cross apply the argument from number 2 at the beginning of this section about obligations being context specific—this by definition makes absolutism impossible. **B)** If I assume a debt that I become unable to pay, I can either break my promise to pay the debt, or steal the money from someone else, both of which would violate moral rules, making action both required and forbidden, which is incoherent. Governments especially face this dilemma—this is why there’s a whole section of political philosophy dedicated to what constitutes a just war. No one wants to go to war but sometimes the situation is forced upon you by external circumstances you can’t control—throwing your hands in the air and declaring war bad is an incoherent response that would get you laughed out of any conversation with actual government officials. The very nature of a government’s existence puts it in precarious situations where appealing to means based standards is incoherent. Consequentialist standards solve by letting us hierarchically order any list of potential acts in terms of some desired outcome.

**Fourth,** util forces us to talk about what actually happens in the real world since we have to use empirics and analyze the consequences of our actions. This promotes topic education because we have to research the effects of actions and research how those effects will come about, thus learning more about the topic in general. Cross apply why topic ed is important.

**Fifth,** util doesn’t make sense in day in day out life unless you are a hedonistic pig, but util is the only philosophy that adequately resolves rights conflicts while **preserving equality**. The key is the forced choice—no matter which action you take, someone will end up upset, and feel violated. Weighing interests equally in such scenarios is the only way to respect equality, which should be a side-constraint on ethical theories since people are by definition created equal. **Especially true for governments**—policymaking cannot be means based because in a conflict scenario, means based philosophies value the rights of one person over the rights of many people because they hold that every person has infinite worth that ought not be violated. However, governments are equally obligated to every citizen as there is no relevant distinction amongst citizens—thus means based stances would treat citizens unequally, violating the government’s obligation to its people.

**Sixth**, here are preempts to common util complaints:

**A)** It doesn’t matter if there are problems with predicting the future. Util doesn’t require perfection. My argument is that we need to be concerned with consequences that we can expect—this is contextualized in the debate round via link and impact cards. Also, this complaint is empirically denied by the fact that governments have effectively done risk analysis for decades. Lastly solved for by the wording of the standard—we only care about expected consequences**.**

**B)** Saying you can’t aggregate individual interest is silly. I’m not saying 5 pens are more valuable than 1 pen, but rather that when we are forced to choose between 5 pens and 1 pen, we should choose 5 pens. The forced choice is key—in a vacuum all pens are equally important, but in a conflict we should opt to protect more pens if all pens are truly equal. This best preserves equality and also ensures we have backups if the ink in a pen explodes or runs out. Also the aggregation argument is empirically denied—the fact that you could drive on a freeway to get to an airport and fly to the tournament is proof that government can aggregate interests. Government had to use eminent domain to tell people who owned the property prior to construction of said freeway and airport—that’s a perfect example of aggregating society’s interests.

**C)** Saying people have subjective interests is non-responsive. I don’t care if you like different ice cream than me, my argument is that all people dislike poverty and crime, and it’s your privilege of being in an economically elite situation that lets you claim otherwise. Saying masochists disprove doesn’t answer this back. The rarity of true masochism shows that masochists are an exception proving the general rule that there are certain experiences in the human condition that are consistently regarded as disgusting and vile, such as rape and boiling new born babies to death. Also, the beauty of util is we can *account* for masochists in the cost-benefit calculations.

**D)** Probability analysis solves infinite consequences, which are scientifically unverifiable anyways. We take minute impacts and round down their probability to zero. Also, even if the world is infinite, our experience of the world is finite. Decision-making doesn’t have to take into account of the rest of forever, it just have to take into account of what can be predicted.

**E)** Side constraints like the constitution are not means based. They only exist to maximize net benefits—they are not absolute. Founding fathers of the US made a bill of rights because their lives were miserable under British rule—those are consequences informing actions. They didn’t care that British intent was benevolent; they were concerned with the bottom line, which the Constitution was written to reflect. Abraham Lincoln violated the constitution more than any other President in history, but he is revered because he helped stop slavery. Also, the fact that the Supreme Court is constantly re-interpreting the Constitution illustrates that it is a fluid side-constraint, not an absolute one. Also supercharged by the fact that we can add amendments literally whenever we want.

#### Contention 1 is poverty:

#### Minimum wage workers are stuck in their earning category—raises are too scarce, trapping the poor in an ongoing cycle of poverty. Fox ‘06[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Though the earnings of most workers rise as they age, prospects for advancement among those earning at or near the minimum wage are not as bright as is often asserted.** A study by William J**. Carrington and** Bruce C. **Fallick found a considerable portion of workers earn wages at or near the minimum wage for extended periods of time.** **Women, people of color, and individuals with lower levels of education are more likely to remain at a level near the minimum wage** for extended periods of time. **Once finished with school, 15.1% of women and 16.2% of blacks spent at least half of the first 10 years of their careers in jobs that paid no more than $1.50 above the minimum wage** (Carrington and Fallick 2001, 23). Additional research by Heather Boushey found evidence supporting Carrington and Fallick’s results. Analyzing the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), Boushey found that **over a third** of prime-age adults (aged 25-64) **in minimum wage jobs remained in them three years later** (Boushey 2005).

#### Living wage pushes families out of poverty, reducing poverty by 12.4 %. Adams and Neumark 04[[4]](#footnote-4)

The evidence on wage and employment effects sets the stage for weighing these competing effects, in particular examining the effect of living wage laws on poverty. To examine the impact of living wages on poverty, we estimate linear probability models for the full sample of families from March Annual Demographic Files of the CPS covering 1995 through 2001. The dependent variable is a dummy variable equal to one if a family’s income falls below the federal government’s threshold for poverty, and zero otherwise. The specification includes city and year dummy variables, and differential trends for cities with and without living wage laws (or with different types of living wage laws). The evidence yields negative point estimates (implying poverty reductions) for both types of living wage laws, but only the estimated effect of business assistance living wage laws is statistically significant (at the ten-percent level). For business assistance living wage laws, the estimated coefficient of −0.024 in Table 2 implies that a one log unit increase in the living wage reduces the poverty rate by 2.4 percent. Relative to an 18.6 percent poverty rate, this represents a 12 percent reduction, or an elasticity of −0.12. This seems like a large effect, given a wage elasticity for low-wage workers below 0.1. Of course, no one is claiming that living wages can lift families from well below the poverty line to well above it. But living wages may help nudge families over the poverty line, and these average wage effects are likely manifested as much larger gains concentrated on a possibly quite small number of workers and families. Thus, even coupled with some employment reductions, living wages can lift a detectable number of families above the poverty line. We return to this point later, in the discussion of Brenner’s (2003) estimates of the number of workers that experienced wage increases as a result of Boston’s living wage law.

#### Living wages also reduce the overall probability of being below the poverty line. Adams and Neumark 2

Second, we examine the effects of living wages on the probability that families are below a wider range of family income thresholds—ranging from one-quarter of the official federal poverty threshold to two times the threshold. Living wage laws may have effects above the poverty threshold either because living wages are commonly pegged to an income level for families with one adult worker that is above this threshold (as in, e.g., San Jose, Hartford, and Madison), or because families affected by living wages have more than one worker. Consistent with the findings on the depth of poverty, we find no significant effects of living wage laws at thresholds well below the poverty line. However, the evidence indicates that living wages—particularly the business assistance variety—reduce the probability that families’ incomes are below three-quarters of the poverty threshold, and the estimated effects are in the same direction and larger (and also significant) at 1.5 times the poverty threshold. Thus, this richer analysis of the effects of living wage laws suggests that in addition to reducing the probability that families are poor, living wages also deliver some gains for families a bit below and a bit above the poverty threshold. On the other hand, the results could reasonably be read as suggesting that living wages do not help the poorest families, which is not entirely surprising because such families are less likely to have workers or may have the lowest wage workers who are most likely to bear the disemployment effects of living wages. An important task for future research, however, is to try to get “inside the black box” of the distributional effects of living wages, to see, for example, whether micro-level evidence confirms that many of the gains from living wages accrue to poor families, and more generally to explore which families (with which types of workers) gain or lose.

#### Poverty kills millions and is equivalent to an ongoing nuclear war on the poor.

Abu-Jamal 98(Mumia, award winning Pennsylvania journalist, quotes James Gilligan, Professor at Harvard/NYU, “A quiet and deadly violence”, <http://www.flashpoints.net/mQuietDeadlyViolence.html>)

The deadliest form of violence is poverty. --GhandiIt has often been observed that America is a truly violent nation, as shown by the thousands of cases of social and communal violence that occurs daily in the nation. Every year, some 20,000 people are killed by others, and additional 20,000 folks kill themselves. Add to this the nonlethal violence that Americans daily inflict on each other, and we begin to see the tracings of a nation immersed in a fever of violence. But, as remarkable, and harrowing as this level and degree of violence is, it is, by far, not the most violent features of living in the midst of the American empire. We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural' violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; By "structural violence" I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting "structural" with "behavioral violence" by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. --(Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it--really? Gilligan notes: [E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world.

**Contention 2 is crime:**

#### Implementing a living wage reduces nonviolent crimes. Fernandez et al ‘14[[5]](#footnote-5)

Discussion of results. To summarize our primary findings, we observe that living wages have a modest negative effect on property-related crimes. The Model 5 estimated elasticities on property crimes suggest that a 1 percentage- point increase in living wage relative to the effective minimum wage results in a 0.05 to 0.15 percent drop in property-related crime. Likewise, the results found when using a simple living-wage-indicator variable in our most restrictive Model 5 suggests that a policy that caused a roughly 50 percent increase in the wages for some fraction of low-wage workers is associated with a 8 per- cent reduction in burglaries, a 6 percent reduction in car thefts, a 4 percent reduction in robberies, and a 3 percent reduction in larceny. At the same time, we find that the living wage has no discernable effect on crimes with weak pecuniary motives including murder, rape, and assault.

#### Contention 3 is big picture weighing

1. Magnitude: systemic impacts happens every day and affects millions of people yearly in the US. I’ll prove lack of brink on your extinction scenario meaning we don’t know when the neg impact will be triggered but we do know that the aff impact is aggregating everyday, meaning the magnitude will be comparable by the time your scenario occurs.
2. Time frame- systemic impacts create irreversible harms to people, i.e. we can’t unmurder a victim and it’s incredibly difficult to rise out of poverty barring a miracle. Prefer impacts that happen on a shorter timeframe since there’s a chance intervening actors can solve your problems, whereas my impact can’t be reversed.
3. Probability—extinction isn’t likely to happen but my impacts are 100% guaranteed to happen. Prefer high probability impacts to low probability high magnitude impacts to prevent policy paralysis—otherwise, every policy action will always focus on the big magnitude and not address issues happening every day that affect millions of citizens. And, given that there are multiple competing big impacts scenarios, paralysis occurs because we don’t know which one to prevent first.

# Underview

1. Re-evaluate the debate under negs interps on both theory and T:

A) key to checking neg flex—bidirectional interps means you can always shift the debate to a preclusive layer. This skews 1AR time because I’m forced to win both theory and case debate and you can go for either in the 2N. Also justifies an RVI if you win theory is reject the debater because otherwise theory is a no-risk issue for my opponent.

B) key to reciprocity—I speak first so I must commit to a framing of the debate. I can’t read T against the neg so it’s a strategy that only the neg gets access too—making it game over allows neg to abuse that power.

C) maximizes topical education since reject debater ends the debate on theory and encourages 1ar to collapse to RVI. Rejecting arg ensures we can continue discussing the topic. Biggest impact to education since the topic is the only thing that changes from tournament to tournament. Also key to fairness because the topic is what we are both most ready and most expected to debate. Deciding the debate on non-substantive issues advantages the debater who has less prep on the topic and is technically stronger.

2. Don’t vote on norm setting or potential abuse

A) Empirically denied as people read contradictory theory arguments all the time. Many people read RVI or no RVI depending on which side of the theory debate they're on. So double bind- either a) norms don't exist and are just a disingenuous tool used by debaters, or b) norms can exist but are too weak to be followed

B) No solvency - nobody is likely to care about one individual round, or even hear about it in the first place. There are thousands of rounds on any given topic, so at best the impact is mooted.

C) Every argument is potentially abusive in its extremes. And because it’s always to neg’s advantage to claim abuse, if the punishment for actual and potential abuse are the same, the purpose of theory to act as a check is destroyed

3. Rounds are improper venues to discuss pre-fiat issues for 2 reasons:

a) the K forces us to cram complex issues into short time limits, preventing any meaningful discussion from actually taking place. This is supercharged by the fact that almost 1/6th of the round becomes moot as per the K since the K undercuts the value of the 1AC. Thus, even if discourse is important, it can't achieve anything *in debate rounds.*

b) pre-fiat impacts force debaters to take opposite sides and continue to affirm or negate, eliminating the chance of actual discussion because the discussion is framed in the context of a competition. There's no incentive to cause real change since we are both ultimately after the ballot. The only way change can actually happen via reps or discourse is in a *non-competitive setting* where both sides aren't trying to gain something from the conversation.

4. The neg must only advocate the converse of the topic, i.e. just government ought not require employers to pay a living wage. 2 warrants: A) this burden structure is most reciprocal since we both have parallel burdens. Neither debater gets access to skepticism or permissibility, which is excellent because these strategies negate the value of the aff case value criterion down and force a restart in the 1AR, arbitrarily nullifying significant portions of my 6 minute speech. B) defending the converse forces topical debate rather than focusing on issues that have no relevance to living wage. Topical debate is key to fairness by ensuring ability to apply research and prep effectively and key to education by creating more meaningful clash.

# Frontlines

#### Neumark et al 12 reconfirms:

These estimates tell us how the various and possibly complicated wage and employment (and hours) effects on individuals ultimately affect families. Table 8 focuses on whether living wages reduce the probability that families are poor. These models are estimated for the full sample, not the lower decile of the wage or skill distribution (or other ranges). Column (1) repeats the estimates from Adams and Neumark (2005b). The estimates are negative for living wages generally and for business assistance living wages (although the point estimate is larger for contractor-only living wages). To interpret the estimates, the −0.024 estimate for business assistance living wage laws, for example, implies that a 100% increase in this type of living wage reduces the poverty rate by 2.4 percentage points. Columns (2) and (3) report the results for the restricted sample (79 cities), and then with city-specific trends. These results are consistent with business assistance living wage laws being the only types of living wage laws that reduce poverty.

#### AT Poverty reductions are offset by wage reductions for those far below the poverty line. Adams and Neumark 04

Although the analysis just described refers to the effects of living wages on poverty, the question of the distributional effects of living wages is more general. We have carried out two related analyses intended to provide a more in-depth analysis of the distributional effects of living wages. First, we use the same difference-in-differences framework to estimate the impact of living wages on the “depth” of poverty among poor families (the percentage by which the family’s total income falls short of the poverty threshold). The estimates reveal no statistical evidence of effects of living wage laws, suggesting that the gains from living wages lifting some families above the poverty line are not offset by income declines, on average, among families below the poverty line.

# Theory

## AT Cannot Spec to Specific Government

#### A) Counter-interp: If the affirmative specs to a specific country, that country must be the United States, and the affirmative must be disclosed

#### B) I meet. I will give offensive reasons to prefer the counterinterp on the original shell. Go there now:

### Parallel Turns

1) Depth: defending a specific country allows us to go in-depth and learn about the intricacies of how living wage affects that specific country instead of defending all governments. In round discussions that happen in depth are key to education because it allows debaters to focus and thoroughly examine a limited number of issues. This outweighs breadth because it gives our education more meaning and fosters critical thinking. Also key to fairness because it allows the debaters to make specific impact and link comparison arguments, thereby allowing the debater who is better at argumentation as opposed to tricks to win.

#### 2) Quality of ground --- living wages vary from country to country

Malachowski 01 – an author on critical theory and the economy

(Malachowski, Alan R. “Business Ethics: Critical Perspectives on Business and Management.” *Routledge* Volume 3 (2001), p. 83. Accessed through Google Books)

One example is the moral requirement not to exploit workers, which means, in part, that they should be paid at least a living wage. What constitutes a living wage varies from country to country. There is no moral requirement that a firm pay mill workers in Lowell, Massachusetts, the same wages that the firm pays similar workers in Bombay, India, or vice-versa. The standards of living are very different. A living wage in Bombay would not be a living wage in Lowell. A living wage in Lowell would be extremely high pay for the typical Bombay mill worker.

End quote. This means that weighing and link ground differs significantly depending on the country in question. Talking about poverty or unemployment from a generic whole-res perspective is nonsensical on this topic because the effects of living wages on unemployment and poverty change depending on the country in question. This allows both the aff and neg to generate more specific links to the topic. Quality ground key to fairness because it is the mechanism by which we construct good arguments to affirm or negate the topic.

Also fosters more real world discussion on the topic, because talking about living wages and poverty from a whole-res perspective oversimplifies the issue at hand. Real world education is valuable because it’s the only portable knowledge we will take with us post-high school.

### AT Quantity of Ground

1. No warrant: most of the links to why living wage is bad is based on the United States. The only ground I would exclude are links based on countries besides the US, but that’s bad ground anyways since it’s unpredictable. The majority of the living wage literature is specific to the United States.
2. No warrant: even if I exclude some ground, you still get access to generic CPs, DAs, NCs, core case turns, and US specific DAs like politics. There’s no reason you need more ground—you already have more than enough.
3. Quality of ground outweighs—

A) If you have a ton of bad arguments you can make, they are still all bad. Quality of argumentation is what makes ground desirable

B) Quantity past a threshold is inaccessible because rounds are too short to read all the arguments you have access too

### AT Topic Lit

#### Turn: majority of the topic lit resides in the US

Maloney 13 – Head of Economics at the Auckland. University of Technology

(Maloney, Tim with Gilbertson, Amanda (2013). “A literature review on the effects of living wage policies.” Prepared by Tim Maloney, Auckland University of Technology for Auckland Council. Auckland Council technical report, TR2013/034)

Because the vast majority of published studies have focused on the possible consequences of living wage laws in the United States, we begin with this area of the literature. These studies are summarised and critiqued in Section 3 of this report.

End quote. This means your interp shifts debate away from the country that has the most topic lit, meaning you actively violate your topic lit standard.

1. No abuse: topic lit isn’t indicative of how fair a position is. Having ground against the aff checks back topic lit because it shows that there is sufficient topic lit.

### AT Predictability

1. <IF THEIR INTERP DOESN’T HAVE DISCLOSURE>: TURN: my interp is more predictable. Under my interp, debaters have to disclose their position, which would allow everyone to know what everyone else is running. Your interp doesn’t mandate disclosure, meaning mine is more predictable.
2. No warrant: defending the US solves predictability. The majority of the topic lit resides in the US.
3. Predictability isn’t verifiable. I don’t know what you prepared before the round because I don’t have the right to look through your expando or laptop. Verifiability is a side constraint to voting on theory because you need to know that the abuse occurred before voting for it.

1. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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